UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/711,820	10/07/2004	Robert P. Rouen	68.0496	5819	
35204 7590 03/06/2008 SCHLUMBERGER RESERVOIR COMPLETIONS 14910 AIRLINE ROAD BOSHARON, TV 77582			EXAMINER		
			ANDREWS, DAVID L		
ROSHARON, TX 77583			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3672			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/06/2008	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

vsolis2@slb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/711,820	ROUEN, ROBERT P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Andrews	3672	

	David Andrews	3672				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converge NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	See attached Notice of Non-Cor		PTOL-324).			
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-16,18-20 and 22-24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.			
<ul> <li>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> <li>11.  ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/David J. Bagnell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3672						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims remain rejected as indicated in the Office action of 12/7/2007. Applicant argues that the modification of McCulloch to incorporate the valves of Pryor would not have been recognized as desirable to one of ordinary skill in the art. However, as addressed in the previous action, the advantage would be to have more precise control over the orifices. Since the oricices on the device of McCulloch are at different depths (fig 6), one of ordinary skill would recognize that individual control over these would be desirable. Pryor also has a wellbore device with a plurality of orifices are different depths. Pyror teaches the descirablilty of controlling the orifices "permitting a variation in the amount of lifting gas supplied to the well necessary to give desired production as conditions in the wellbore change." The arguments presented to the specific integration of the valves of Pryor on the device of McCulloch are not persuasive since one of ordinary skill in the art would have good reason to choose valves, which workable with the teachings of Pryor, are suitable for the device of McCulloch without compromising the purpose of the original device.

Applicant additionally argues that claim 22 is non-obvious under McCulloch, Pryor and McCarvell since Pryor and McCarvell are concerned with valves on production tubing. The examiner agrees that the valves arrangements of Pryor and McCarvell are arranged on production tubing rather that a member within, but the examiner also submits that these teachings are relevant since they are concerned with the same problem of that of McCulloch, i.e. that of gas lift arrangements for producing wells. One of ordinary skill, would look to the teachings of Pryor and McCarvell to improve the device of McCulloch since all are concerned with gas lift within a wellbore environment.